



## Community Sounding Board Meeting

Meeting Summary  
May 2, 2007

### *Attendees*

Community Members	Others	
David Lindmeir	Ned Hacker, WFRC	Jim Horrocks, Horrocks Engineers
Harris Adams	Charles Mace, UDOT	Brad Powell, Horrocks Engineers
Bill Eccleston	Tom Roylance, Layton City	Mack Christensen, Horrocks Engineers
	Ryan Bankhead, Layton City	Stan Jorgensen, Horrocks
	Greg Punske, FHWA	Lori Isenberg, Northwest Dynamics, Inc.

### *Handouts*

Updated alternatives maps (Replace the handouts from the meeting with these updated ones).

### *Opening*

Lori Isenberg welcomed the group and presented the purpose of the meeting, which is to determine which alternatives meet Purpose and Need and should be moved to the next level of study, and which do not meet the Purpose and Need and should not be forwarded.

### *Alternatives Discussion*

Jim Horrocks provided a quick recap of the action items from the April 25 meeting. He reminded the group that at the end of that meeting there was some discussion on whether or not alternatives 1 and 5 could be eliminated. David Lindmeir asked to have alternatives 1F and 5E combined and 2G and 5E combined to see what difference they would make.

Before reviewing the new modeling results, the three-fold Purpose and Need was reviewed again:

- Address current and projected traffic demand and operations for the South Layton Interchange (I-15 Exit 330) Address current and projected traffic demand and operations for the South Layton Interchange (I-15 Exit 330)
- Provide grade-separated transportation access across the Union Pacific Railroad to the developing area of west Layton
- Provide adequate transportation facilities and traffic capacity west of I-15 to relieve existing and projected traffic congestion on Gentile Street

The Horrocks team presented the results of the modeling and engaged in discussion with the CSB members. Following the discussion, the group agreed to the following (each CSB member verbally indicated support):

- **Alternatives 1 and 5** do not meet Purpose and Need and should not be moved forward.
- **Sub alternatives G,H and I of Alternative 2** should be moved to the next screening level.
- All sub-alternatives will be shown at the open house



- **Alternatives 3 and 4**, some combination can be made to fit the P&N

Outlined below are some of the key points made during the discussion of the various alternatives:

- *Gentile Street*

The results of the historic properties study will dictate what can and cannot be done on Gentile Street and therefore, what needs to happen in other areas. That study is being started and will take a couple of months to complete. Until then, there is no point in further upsetting the adjacent property owners with potential changes to their street.

If it is widened at all it is going to impact the people living there because of increased traffic and driveways connecting. Need to look at those areas and make sure the people are aware of the studies.

- *Related Transportation Projects*

The modeling assumes Legacy is built and the planned improvements (WFRC long range plan) for I-15 have been completed. If we get to the end and have two alternatives that are very close, Horrocks can do some sensitivity testing related to the construction of Legacy and improvements of I-15.

- *Credibility of Modeling*

In response to a question about the credibility of the modeling, Jim explained Horrocks has gone beyond the industry standard for their modeling runs. The model being used comes from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and is used to model the entire Wasatch Front area. That model uses large traffic analysis zones (TAZ) to model the entire area. However, Horrocks Engineers has broken the TAZ into smaller zones. During the modeling process, Horrocks continually conducts quality assurance and quality control (QC/QA) reviews. Thus far, UDOT, WFRC, and Mike Brown from Wilbur Smith have reviewed the model and agree with the methodology and steps that have been taken.

- *Cost*

Project cost does not drive the decision, it is one variable in the decision, along with environmental concerns, community impacts, etc.

- *Public Involvement Process*

David commented that this study process is very different from the EA because Horrocks is checking every potential option suggested. He stated we understand not everyone will be happy with the outcome, but at least they will know that everything was considered.

- No need for further public outreach (other than CSB meetings) until the historic structures study is completed.

### *Wrap-up and Next Steps*

We will try to stick to the fourth Wednesday of the month for meetings agreed upon in the Feb. meeting. We will NOT need another meeting in May. The next meeting will be held **June 27**.